

REMARKSComments regarding restriction requirement

Newly added claims 27-32 are "method of making" and "method of use" claims which depend from product claim 1. Therefore, upon allowance of claim 1, it is believed that claims 27-32 should be rejoined and considered, in accordance with the Commissioner's Notice in the Official Gazette of March 26, 1996, entitled "Guidance on Treatment of Product and Process Claims in light of *In re Ochiai*, *In re Brouwer* and 35 U.S.C. § 103(b)."

Utility rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 101 and § 112

The rejections of claims 1, 18-20, 25 and 26 are improper, as the inventions of those claims have a patentable utility as set forth in the instant specification, and/or a utility well-known to one of ordinary skill in the art.

The invention at issue, identified in the patent application as a novel human prostate-associated kallikrein protein, abbreviated as HPAK, is a polypeptide sequence encoded by a gene that is expressed in humans. The novel polypeptide is demonstrated in the specification to be a member of the serine protease family, and kallikrein subfamily (Specification, p. 1, lines 7-8; p. 11, lines 6-12). As such, the claimed invention has numerous practical, beneficial uses in toxicology testing, drug development, and the diagnosis of disease, none of which require knowledge of how the polypeptide actually functions. As a result of the benefits of these uses, the claimed invention already enjoys significant commercial success.

Applicants' invention comprises, *inter alia*, a novel human prostate-associated kallikrein protein (hereinafter referred to as HPAK), and naturally-occurring amino acid sequences at least 90% identical to the amino acid sequence of SEQ ID NO:1. HPAK, and variants thereof, are useful in the diagnosis of acquired and inherited disease, expression profiling, and drug development. HPAK shares chemical and structural homology with human pancreatic kallikrein (GI 186653). In particular, HPAK shares 54% identity with GI 186653, including the conserved amino acid residues for serine protease activity, H₆₅ D₁₁₃, and S₂₀₆. Also conserved are 10 cysteine residues (31, 50, 66, 145, 166, 177, 191,

92490

5

04/26/02 04:21 PM
02079.015 — [PA]107290.1

do not have
serine
activity
only conserved
isolated a. a.
not even conserved
a sequence

202, 212, and 227; see Figure 2) which are structurally important and involved in the formation of 5 disulfide bonds, as well as D₂₀₀, which likely confers chymotrypsinogen-like activity on HPAK. The similar hydrophobicity plots of HPAK and GI 186653 (Figures 3 and 4) indicate that these molecules have a similar structure.

The similarity of the claimed polypeptide to another polypeptide of known, undisputed utility by itself demonstrates utility beyond the reasonable probability required by law. HPAK is, in that regard, homologous to human pancreatic kallikrein, a protein having both serine protease activity and kallikrein-like cleavage specificity. In particular, the two polypeptides share more than 52 % sequence identity over 253 amino acid residues. HPAK and human pancreatic kallikrein also share similar amino terminal signal sequences, hydrophobicity plots and conserved residues for serine protease activity, H₆₅, D₁₁₃, and S₂₀₆ (Figures 2, 3 and 4).

This is more than enough homology to demonstrate a reasonable probability that the utility of human pancreatic kallikrein can be imputed to the claimed invention. It is well-known that the probability that two unrelated polypeptides share more than 40% sequence homology over 70 amino acid residues is exceedingly small. Brenner et al., Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U.S.A. 95:6073-78 (1998). Given homology in excess of 40% over many more than 70 amino acid residues, the probability that the claimed polypeptide is related to human pancreatic kallikrein is, accordingly, very high.

There is, in addition, direct proof of the utility of the claimed invention. Applicants submit herewith the Declaration of Lars Michael Furness¹ describing some of the practical uses of the claimed invention in gene and protein expression monitoring applications as they would have been understood at the time of the patent application. The Furness Declaration describes, in particular, how the claimed polypeptide can be used in protein expression analysis techniques such as 2-D PAGE gels and western blots. Using the claimed invention with these techniques, persons of ordinary skill in the art can better assess, for example, the potential toxic affect of a drug candidate. (Furness Declaration at ¶ 11).

¹ The Furness Declaration is submitted herewith in unexecuted form. The executed Declaration will be provided to the Patent Office as soon as it is available.

*Declaⁿ
not
signed →*

The Patent Examiner does not dispute that the claimed polypeptide can be used in 2-D PAGE gels and western blots to perform drug toxicity testing. Instead, the Patent Examiner contends that the claimed polypeptide cannot be useful without precise knowledge of its function. But the law never has required knowledge of biological function to prove utility. It is the claimed invention's uses, not its functions, that are the subject of a proper analysis under the utility requirement.

In any event, as demonstrated by the Furness Declaration, the person of ordinary skill in the art can achieve beneficial results from the claimed polypeptide in the absence of any knowledge as to the precise function of the protein. The uses of the claimed polypeptide for gene expression monitoring applications including toxicology testing are in fact independent of its precise function.

I. The Applicable Legal Standard

To meet the utility requirement of sections 101 and 112 of the Patent Act, the patent applicant need only show that the claimed invention is "practically useful," *Anderson v. Natta*, 480 F.2d 1392, 1397, 178 USPQ 458 (CCPA 1973) and confers a "specific benefit" on the public. *Brenner v. Manson*, 383 U.S. 519, 534-35, 148 USPQ 689 (1966). As discussed in a recent Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit case, this threshold is not high:

An invention is "useful" under section 101 if it is capable of providing some identifiable benefit. See *Brenner v. Manson*, 383 U.S. 519, 534 [148 USPQ 689] (1966); *Brooktree Corp. v. Advanced Micro Devices, Inc.*, 977 F.2d 1555, 1571 [24 USPQ2d 1401] (Fed. Cir. 1992) ("to violate Section 101 the claimed device must be totally incapable of achieving a useful result"); *Fuller v. Berger*, 120 F. 274, 275 (7th Cir. 1903) (test for utility is whether invention "is incapable of serving any beneficial end").

Juicy Whip Inc. v. Orange Bang Inc., 51 USPQ2d 1700 (Fed. Cir. 1999).

While an asserted utility must be described with specificity, the patent applicant need not demonstrate utility to a certainty. In *Stiftung v. Renishaw PLC*, 945 F.2d 1173, 1180, 20 USPQ2d 1094 (Fed. Cir. 1991), the United States Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit explained:

An invention need not be the best or only way to accomplish a certain result, and it need only be useful to some extent and in certain applications: "[T]he fact that an invention has only limited utility and is only operable in certain applications is not

grounds for finding lack of utility.” *Envirotech Corp. v. Al George, Inc.*, 730 F.2d 753, 762, 221 USPQ 473, 480 (Fed. Cir. 1984).

The specificity requirement is not, therefore, an onerous one. If the asserted utility is described so that a person of ordinary skill in the art would understand how to use the claimed invention, it is sufficiently specific. *See Standard Oil Co. v. Montedison, S.p.a.*, 212 U.S.P.Q. 327, 343 (3d Cir. 1981). The specificity requirement is met unless the asserted utility amounts to a “nebulous expression” such as “biological activity” or “biological properties” that does not convey meaningful information about the utility of what is being claimed. *Cross v. Iizuka*, 753 F.2d 1040, 1048 (Fed. Cir. 1985).

In addition to conferring a specific benefit on the public, the benefit must also be “substantial.” *Brenner*, 383 U.S. at 534. A “substantial” utility is a practical, “real-world” utility. *Nelson v. Bowler*, 626 F.2d 853, 856, 206 USPQ 881 (CCPA 1980).

If persons of ordinary skill in the art would understand that there is a “well-established” utility for the claimed invention, the threshold is met automatically and the applicant need not make any showing to demonstrate utility. Manual of Patent Examination Procedure at § 706.03(a). Only if there is no “well-established” utility for the claimed invention must the applicant demonstrate the practical benefits of the invention. *Id.*

Once the patent applicant identifies a specific utility, the claimed invention is presumed to possess it. *In re Cortright*, 165 F.3d 1353, 1357, 49 USPQ2d 1464 (Fed. Cir. 1999); *In re Brana*, 51 F.3d 1560, 1566; 34 USPQ2d 1436 (Fed. Cir. 1995). In that case, the Patent Office bears the burden of demonstrating that a person of ordinary skill in the art would reasonably doubt that the asserted utility could be achieved by the claimed invention. *Id.* To do so, the Patent Office must provide evidence or sound scientific reasoning. *See In re Langer*, 503 F.2d 1380, 1391-92, 183 USPQ 288 (CCPA 1974). If and only if the Patent Office makes such a showing, the burden shifts to the applicant to provide rebuttal evidence that would convince the person of ordinary skill that there is sufficient proof of utility. *Brana*, 51 F.3d at 1566. The applicant need only prove a “substantial likelihood” of utility; certainty is not required. *Brenner*, 383 U.S. at 532.

II Use of the claimed polypeptides for diagnosis of conditions or diseases characterized by expression of HPAK, for toxicology testing, and for drug discovery are sufficient utilities under 35 U.S.C. §§ 101 and 112, first paragraph

The claimed invention meets all of the necessary requirements for establishing a credible utility under the Patent Law: There are “well-established” uses for the claimed invention known to persons of ordinary skill in the art, and there are specific practical and beneficial uses for the invention disclosed in the patent application’s specification. These uses are explained, in detail, in the accompanying Furness Declaration. Objective evidence, not considered by the Patent Office, further corroborates the credibility of the asserted utilities.

A. The similarity of the claimed polypeptide to another of undisputed utility demonstrates utility

Because there is a substantial likelihood that the claimed HPAK is functionally related to human pancreatic kallikrein, a polypeptide of undisputed utility, there is by implication a substantial likelihood that the claimed polypeptide is similarly useful. Applicants need not show any more to demonstrate utility. *In re Brana*, 51 F.3d at 1567.

It is undisputed, and readily apparent from the patent application, that the claimed polypeptide shares more than 52% sequence identity over 253 amino acid residues with human pancreatic kallikrein. HPAK and human pancreatic kallikrein also share similar amino terminal signal sequences, hydrophobicity plots and conserved residues critical for serine protease activity, H₆₅, D₁₁₃, and S₂₀₆ (Figures 2, 3 and 4). This is more than enough homology to demonstrate a reasonable probability that the utility of human pancreatic kallikrein can be imputed to the claimed invention. It is well-known that the probability that two unrelated polypeptides share more than 40% sequence homology over 70 amino acid residues is exceedingly small. Brenner et. al., Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. 95:6073-78 (1998). Given homology in excess of 40% over many more than 70 amino acid residues, the probability that the claimed polypeptide is related to human pancreatic kallikrein is, accordingly, very high.

The Examiner must accept the Applicants’ demonstration that the homology between the claimed invention and human pancreatic kallikrein demonstrates utility by a reasonable probability unless the Examiner can demonstrate through evidence or sound scientific reasoning that a person of

ordinary skill in the art would doubt utility. *See In re Langer*, 503 F.2d 1380, 1391-92, 183 USPQ 288 (CCPA 1974). The Examiner has not provided sufficient evidence or sound scientific reasoning to the contrary.

While the Examiner has cited literature identifying some of the difficulties that may be involved in predicting protein function, none suggest that functional homology cannot be inferred by a reasonable probability in this case. Bork, *Genome Research*, 10:398-400 (2000); Bowie et al. (*Science* (1990) 247:1306-1310); Lazar et al. (*Mol. and Cell. Biol.* (1988) 8:1247-1252); and Burgess et al. (*J. Cell Biol.* (1990) 111:2129-2138), all of record. Importantly, none contradict Brenner's basic rule that sequence homology in excess of 40% over 70 or more amino acid residues yields a high probability of functional homology as well. Nor do they contradict the presence in HPAK at the amino terminal end, 24 amino acids which are hydrophilic and similar to signal sequences important for kallikrein secretion, or that residues H₆₅, D₁₁₃, and S₂₀₆ are important for serine protease activity, or that residue D₂₀₀ is likely to confer chymotrypsinogen-like activity to HPAK. At most, these articles individually and together stand for the proposition that it is difficult to make predictions about function with certainty. The standard applicable in this case is not, however, proof to certainty, but rather proof to reasonable probability.

B. The uses of HPAK for toxicology testing, drug discovery, and disease diagnosis are practical uses that confer "specific benefits" to the public

The claimed invention has specific, substantial, real-world utility by virtue of its use in toxicology testing, drug development and disease diagnosis through gene expression profiling. These uses are explained in detail in the accompanying Furness Declaration, the substance of which is not rebutted by the Patent Examiner. There is no dispute that the claimed invention is in fact a useful tool in two-dimensional polyacrylamide gel electrophoresis ("2-D PAGE") analysis and western blots used to monitor protein expression and assess drug toxicity.

The instant application is a divisional of, and claims priority to, U.S. Ser. No. 08/790,137, filed January 29, 1997, having the identical Specification, (hereinafter "the Hillman '137 application").

In his Declaration, Mr. Furness explains the many reasons why a person skilled in the art who read the Hillman '137 application on January 29, 1997 would have understood that application to disclose the claimed polypeptide to be useful for a number of gene and protein expression monitoring applications, *e.g.*, in 2-D PAGE technologies, in connection with the development of drugs and the monitoring of the activity of such drugs. (Furness Declaration at, *e.g.*, ¶¶ 11-13). Much, but not all, of Mr. Furness' explanation concerns the use of the claimed polypeptide in the creation of protein expression maps using 2-D PAGE.

2-D PAGE technologies were developed during the 1980's. Since the early 1990's, 2-D PAGE has been used to create maps showing the differential expression of proteins in different cell types or in similar cell types in response to drugs and potential toxic agents. Each expression pattern reveals the state of a tissue or cell type in its given environment, *e.g.*, in the presence or absence of a drug. By comparing a map of cells treated with a potential drug candidate to a map of cells not treated with the candidate, for example, the potential toxicity of a drug can be assessed. (Furness Declaration at ¶ 10.)

The claimed invention makes 2-D PAGE analysis a more powerful tool for toxicology and drug efficacy testing. A person of ordinary skill in the art can derive more information about the state or states or tissue or cell samples from 2-D PAGE analysis with the claimed invention than without it. As Mr. Furness explains:

In view of the Hillman '137 application, the Wilkins article, and other related pre-January 1997 publications, persons skilled in the art on January 29, 1997 clearly would have understood the Hillman '137 application to disclose the SEQ ID NO:1 polypeptide to be useful in 2-D PAGE analyses for the development of new drugs and monitoring the activities of drugs for such purposes as evaluating their efficacy and toxicity (Furness Declaration, ¶ 10)

* * *

Persons skilled in the art would appreciate that a 2-D PAGE map that utilized the SEQ ID NO:1 polypeptide sequence would be a more useful tool than a 2-D PAGE map that did not utilize this protein sequence in connection with conducting protein expression monitoring studies on proposed (or actual) drugs for treating cancer and disorders of the prostate for such purposes as evaluating their efficacy and toxicity. (Furness Declaration, ¶ 12)

Mr. Furness' observations are confirmed in the literature published before the filing of the patent application. Wilkins, for example, describes how 2-D gels are used to define proteins present in various tissues and measure their levels of expression, the data from which is in turn used in databases:

For proteome projects, the aim of [computer-aided 2-D PAGE] analysis . . . is to catalogue all spots from the 2-D gel in a qualitative and if possible quantitative manner, so as to define the number of proteins present and their levels of expression. Reference gel images, constructed from one or more gels, for the basis of two-dimensional gel databases. (Wilkins, Tab C, p. 26).

C. The use of proteins expressed by humans as tools for toxicology testing, drug discovery, and the diagnosis of disease is now "well-established"

The technologies made possible by expression profiling using polypeptides are now well-established. The technical literature recognizes not only the prevalence of these technologies, but also their unprecedented advantages in drug development, testing and safety assessment. These technologies include toxicology testing, as described by Furness in his Declaration.

Toxicology testing is now standard practice in the pharmaceutical industry. See, *e.g.*, John C. Rockett, et. al., Differential gene expression in drug metabolism and toxicology: practicalities, problems, and potential, *Xenobiotica* 29:655-691 (July 1999) (Reference of record, see Response to Office Action, filed April 9, 2001):

Knowledge of toxin-dependent regulation in target tissues is not solely an academic pursuit as much interest has been generated in the pharmaceutical industry to harness this technology in the early identification of toxic drug candidates, thereby shortening the developmental process and contributing substantially to the safety assessment of new drugs. ((Reference of record, see Response to Office Action, filed April 9, 2001), page 656)

To the same effect are several other scientific publications, including Emile F. Nuwaysir, et al., Microarrays and Toxicology: The Advent of Toxicogenomics, *Molecular Carcinogenesis* 24:153-159 (1999); Sandra Steiner and N. Leigh Anderson, Expression profiling in toxicology -- potentials and limitations, *Toxicology Letters* 112-13:467-471 (2000) (References of record, see Response to Office Action, filed April 9, 2001).

The more genes – and, accordingly, the polypeptides they encode -- that are available for use in toxicology testing, the more powerful the technique. Control genes are carefully selected for their stability across a large set of array experiments in order to best study the effect of toxicological compounds. See attached email from the primary investigator, Dr. Cynthia Afshari to an Incyte employee, dated July 3, 2000, as well as the original message to which she was responding (Reference of record, see Response to Office Action, filed April 9, 2001) Thus, there is no expressed gene which is irrelevant to screening for toxicological effects, and all expressed genes have a utility for toxicological screening.

In fact, the potential benefit to the public, in terms of lives saved and reduced health care costs, are enormous. Recent developments provide evidence that the benefits of this information are already beginning to manifest themselves. Examples include the following:

- In 1999, CV Therapeutics, an Incyte collaborator, was able to use Incyte gene expression technology, information about the structure of a known transporter gene, and chromosomal mapping location, to identify the key gene associated with Tangier disease. This discovery took place over a matter of only a few weeks, due to the power of these new genomics technologies. The discovery received an award from the American Heart Association as one of the top 10 discoveries associated with heart disease research in 1999.
- In an April 9, 2000, article published by the Bloomberg news service, an Incyte customer stated that it had reduced the time associated with target discovery and validation from 36 months to 18 months, through use of Incyte's genomic information database. Other Incyte customers have privately reported similar experiences. The implications of this significant saving of time and expense for the number of drugs that may be developed and their cost are obvious.
- In a February 10, 2000, article in the *Wall Street Journal*, one Incyte customer stated that over 50 percent of the drug targets in its current pipeline were derived from the Incyte database. Other Incyte customers have privately reported similar experiences. By doubling the number of targets available to pharmaceutical researchers, Incyte genomic information has demonstrably accelerated the development of new drugs.

Because the Patent Examiner failed to address or consider the “well-established” utilities for the claimed invention in toxicology testing, drug development, and the diagnosis of disease, the Examiner's rejections should be withdrawn regardless of their merit.

D. Objective evidence corroborates the utilities of the claimed invention

There is in fact no restriction on the kinds of evidence a Patent Examiner may consider in determining whether a “real-world” utility exists. “Real-world” evidence, such as evidence showing actual use or commercial success of the invention, can demonstrate conclusive proof of utility. *Raytheon v. Roper*, 220 USPQ2d 592 (Fed. Cir. 1983); *Nestle v. Eugene*, 55 F.2d 854, 856, 12 USPQ 335 (6th Cir. 1932). Indeed, proof that the invention is made, used or sold by any person or entity other than the patentee is conclusive proof of utility. *United States Steel Corp. v. Phillips Petroleum Co.*, 865 F.2d 1247, 1252, 9 USPQ2d 1461 (Fed. Cir. 1989).

Over the past several years, a vibrant market has developed for databases containing all expressed genes (along with the polypeptide translations of those genes), in particular genes having medical and pharmaceutical significance such as the instant sequence. (Note that the value in these databases is enhanced by their completeness, but each sequence in them is independently valuable.) The databases sold by Applicants’ assignee, Incyte, include exactly the kinds of information made possible by the claimed invention, such as tissue and disease associations. Incyte sells its database containing the claimed sequence and millions of other sequences throughout the scientific community, including to pharmaceutical companies who use the information to develop new pharmaceuticals.

Both Incyte’s customers and the scientific community have acknowledged that Incyte’s databases have proven to be valuable in, for example, the identification and development of drug candidates. As Incyte adds information to its databases, including the information that can be generated only as a result of Incyte’s discovery of the claimed polypeptide, the databases become even more powerful tools. Thus the claimed invention adds more than incremental benefit to the drug discovery and development process.

III. The Patent Examiner’s Rejections Are Without Merit

Rather than responding to the evidence demonstrating utility, the Examiner attempts to dismiss it altogether by arguing that the disclosed and well-established utilities for the claimed polypeptide are not

"specific, substantial, and credible" utilities. The Examiner is incorrect both as a matter of law and as a matter of fact.

A. The Presence of mRNA from an Expressed Gene Provides Evidence of Protein Translation

The Office Action has set forth the novel theory that the central dogma of molecular biology (*i.e.*, DNA directs transcription of messenger RNA which in turn directs translation of protein) somehow does not apply to the discoveries of the present application. That is, the nucleotide sequence of SEQ ID NO:2 (which encodes the polypeptide of SEQ ID NO:1) was determined from human cDNA libraries. Those cDNA libraries in turn were made from messenger RNA isolated from human tissue. See the Specification, for example, at page 10, line 29 through page 12, line 4, and page 37, line 23 through page 38, line 12. "Northern analysis reveals the expression pattern of this sequence in various libraries (Fig. 5). Of the 15 tissues in which HPAK is expressed, six are from the prostate gland and seven come from cancer patients." (Specification, page 11, lines 17-19.) Thus, the nucleotide sequences of the present invention are expressed sequences. The Examiner purports that the existence of an expressed mRNA does not insure that the protein encoded by the mRNA will be translated and, hence, "it is not clear whether SEQ ID NO:1 exists in nature."

Regulation of gene expression occurs at many levels, including transcription, splicing, polyadenylation, mRNA stability, mRNA transport and compartmentalization, translation efficiency, protein modification, and protein turnover. While steady state mRNA levels are not always directly proportional to the amount of protein produced in a cell, mRNA levels are **routinely** used as an indicator of protein expression. Countless scientific publications have been based on data relating to mRNA levels when the polypeptide encoded by the mRNA was unknown or difficult to detect. Moreover, mRNA levels are **usually** a good indicator of protein levels in a cell. The Office Action cites several examples of protein regulation downstream of transcription; however, these examples represent comparatively unusual mechanisms of gene regulation (Alberts et al., Shantz and Pegg, McClean and Hill, and Fu et al.). According to B. Lewin [(1997) Genes VI Oxford University Press, Inc. New York, NY] (Reference No. 8, pages enclosed):

Transcription of a gene in the active state is controlled at the stage of initiation, that is, by the interaction of RNA polymerase with its promoter. This is now becoming susceptible to study in the *in vitro* systems... ***For most genes, this is a major control point; probably it is the most common level of regulation.*** [page 847, emphasis added].

But having acknowledged that control of gene expression can occur at multiple stages, and that production of RNA cannot inevitably be equated with production of protein, it is clear that ***the overwhelming majority of regulatory events occur at the initiation of transcription. Regulation of tissue-specific gene transcription lies at the heart of eukaryotic differentiation.*** [pages 847-848, emphasis added]

Thus regardless of whether there is the potential for post-transcriptional regulation of SEQ ID NO:1 expression, one skilled in the art would have a reasonable expectation that SEQ ID NO:1 expression correlates with the levels of SEQ ID NO:2 mRNA. In the case of the instant invention, one skilled in the art would be imprudent in assuming, *a priori*, that protein levels did not correspond to mRNA levels and that levels of SEQ ID NO:1 were controlled predominantly in a post-transcriptional manner, thereby dismissing the significance of mRNA levels. Inasmuch as the predictive value of mRNA levels applies to the utility of Applicants' invention, Applicants request withdrawal of the rejection.

B. The Precise Biological Role Or Function Of An Expressed Polypeptide Is Not Required To Demonstrate Utility

The Patent Examiner's primary rejection of the claimed invention is based on the ground that, without information as to the precise "biological role" of the claimed invention, the claimed invention's utility is not sufficiently specific. According to the Examiner, it is not enough that a person of ordinary skill in the art could use and, in fact, would want to use the claimed invention either by itself or in a 2-D gel or western blot to monitor the expression of genes for such applications as the evaluation of a drug's efficacy and toxicity. The Examiner would require, in addition, that the applicant provide a specific and substantial interpretation of the results generated in any given expression analysis.

It may be that specific and substantial interpretations and detailed information on biological function are necessary to satisfy the requirements for publication in some technical journals, but they are

not necessary to satisfy the requirements for obtaining a United States patent. The relevant question is not, as the Examiner would have it, whether it is known how or why the invention works, *In re Cortwright*, 165 F.3d 1353, 1359 (Fed. Cir. 1999), but rather whether the invention provides an "identifiable benefit" in presently available form. *Juicy Whip Inc. v. Orange Bang Inc.*, 185 F.3d 1364, 1366 (Fed. Cir. 1999). If the benefit exists, and there is a substantial likelihood the invention provides the benefit, it is useful. There can be no doubt, particularly in view of the Furness Declaration (at, e.g., ¶¶ 10-13), that the present invention meets this test.

The threshold for determining whether an invention produces an identifiable benefit is low. *Juicy Whip*, 185 F.3d at 1366. Only those utilities that are so nebulous that a person of ordinary skill in the art would not know how to achieve an identifiable benefit and, at least according to the PTO guidelines, so-called "throwaway" utilities that are not directed to a person of ordinary skill in the art at all, do not meet the statutory requirement of utility. Utility Examination Guidelines, 66 Fed. Reg. 1092 (Jan. 5, 2001).

Knowledge of the biological function or role of a biological molecule has never been required to show real-world benefit. In its most recent explanation of its own utility guidelines, the PTO acknowledged as much (66 F.R. at 1095):

[T]he utility of a claimed DNA does not necessarily depend on the function of the encoded gene product. A claimed DNA may have specific and substantial utility because, e.g., it hybridizes near a disease-associated gene or it has gene-regulating activity.

By implicitly requiring knowledge of biological function for any claimed polypeptide, the Examiner has, contrary to law, elevated what is at most an evidentiary factor into an absolute requirement of utility. Rather than looking to the biological role or function of the claimed invention, the Examiner should have looked first to the benefits it is alleged to provide.

C. Membership in a Class of Useful Products Can Be Proof of Utility

Despite the uncontradicted evidence that the claimed polypeptide is a member of the kallikrein family, whose members indisputably are useful, the Examiner refused to impute the utility of the members of the kallikrein family to HPAK. In the November 26, 2001 Office Action, the Patent

Examiner takes the position that unless Applicants can identify which particular biological function within the class of kallikreins is possessed by HPAK, utility cannot be imputed. To demonstrate utility by membership in the class of kallikreins, the Examiner would require that all kallikreins possess a "common" utility.

There is no such requirement in the law. In order to demonstrate utility by membership in a class, the law requires only that the class not contain a substantial number of useless members. So long as the class does not contain a substantial number of useless members, there is sufficient likelihood that the claimed invention will have utility and a rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 101 is improper. That is true regardless of how the claimed invention ultimately is used and whether the members of the class possess one utility or many. *See Brenner v. Manson*, 383 U.S. 519, 532 (1966); *Application of Kirk*, 376 F.2d 936, 943 (CCPA 1967).

Membership in a "general" class is insufficient to demonstrate utility only if the class contains a substantial number of useless members. There would be, in that case, a substantial likelihood that the claimed invention is one of the useless members of the class. In the few cases in which class membership did not prove utility by substantial likelihood, the classes did in fact include predominately useless members. *E.g.*, *Brenner* (man-made steroids); *Kirk* (same); *Natta* (man-made polyethylene polymers).²

The Examiner addresses HPAK as if the general class in which it is included is not the kallikrein family, but rather all polypeptides, including the vast majority of useless theoretical molecules not occurring in nature, and thus not pre-selected by nature to be useful. While these "general classes" may contain a substantial number of useless members, the kallikrein family does not. The kallikrein family is sufficiently specific to rule out any reasonable possibility that HPAK would not also be useful like the other members of the family.

²At a recent Biotechnology Customer Partnership Meeting, PTO Senior Examiner James Martinell described an analytical framework roughly consistent with this analysis. He stated that when an applicant's claimed protein "is a member of a family of proteins that already are known based upon sequence homology," that can be an effective assertion of utility.

Because the Examiner has not presented any evidence that the kallikrein class of proteins has any, let alone a substantial number, of useless members, the Examiner must conclude that there is a "substantial likelihood" that the HPAK encoded by the claimed polypeptide is useful.

Even if the Examiner's "common utility" criterion were correct – and it is not – the kallikrein family would meet it. It is undisputed that known members of the kallikrein family have serine protease activity. A person of ordinary skill in the art need not know any more about how the claimed invention functions as a serine protease to use it, and the Examiner presents no evidence to the contrary. Instead, the Examiner makes the conclusory observation that a person of ordinary skill in the art would need to know whether, for example, any given kallikrein has serine protease activity. The Examiner then goes on to assume that the only use for HPAK absent knowledge as to how this member of the kallikrein family actually works is further study of HPAK itself.

Not so. As demonstrated by Applicants, knowledge that HPAK is a kallikrein is more than sufficient to make it useful for the diagnosis and treatment of cancer and disorders of the prostate. Indeed, HPAK has been shown to be expressed in prostate cancer tissue, and breast and parotid gland tumors. The Examiner must accept these facts to be true unless the Examiner can provide evidence or sound scientific reasoning to the contrary. But the Examiner has not done so.

D. The uses of HPAK in toxicology testing, drug discovery, and disease diagnosis are practical uses beyond mere study of the invention itself

The Examiner rejected the claims at issue on the ground that the use of an invention as tool for research is not a "substantial" use. Because the Examiner's rejection assumes a substantial overstatement of the law, and is incorrect in fact, it must be overturned.

There is no authority for the proposition that use as a tool for research is not a substantial utility. Indeed, the Patent Office itself has recognized that just because an invention is used in a research setting does not mean that it lacks utility (Section 2107.01 of the Manual of Patent Examining Procedure, 8th Edition, August 2001, under the heading I. Specific and Substantial Requirements, Research Tools):

Many research tools such as gas chromatographs, screening assays, and nucleotide sequencing techniques have a clear, specific and unquestionable utility (e.g., they are useful in analyzing compounds). An assessment that focuses on whether an invention is

useful only in a research setting thus does not address whether the specific invention is in fact “useful” in a patent sense. Instead, Office personnel must distinguish between inventions that have a specifically identified substantial utility and inventions whose asserted utility requires further research to identify or reasonably confirm.

The PTO’s actual practice has been, at least until the present, consistent with that approach. It has routinely issued patents for inventions whose only use is to facilitate research, such as DNA ligases, acknowledged by the PTO’s Training Materials to be useful.

The subset of research uses that are not “substantial” utilities is limited. It consists only of those uses in which the claimed invention is to be an **object** of further study, thus merely inviting further research on the invention itself. This follows from *Brenner*, in which the U.S. Supreme Court held that a process for making a compound does not confer a substantial benefit where the only known use of the compound was to be the object of further research to determine its use. *Id.* at 535. Similarly, in *Kirk*, the Court held that a compound would not confer substantial benefit on the public merely because it might be used to synthesize some other, unknown compound that would confer substantial benefit. *Kirk*, 376 F.2d at 940, 945. (“What appellants are really saying to those in the art is take these steroids, experiment, and find what use they do have as medicines.”) Nowhere do those cases state or imply, however, that a material cannot be patentable if it has some other, additional beneficial use in research.

Such beneficial uses beyond studying the claimed invention itself have been demonstrated, in particular those described in the Furness Declaration. The Furness Declaration demonstrates that the claimed invention is a tool, rather than an object, of research, and it demonstrates exactly how that tool is used. Without the claimed invention, it would be more difficult to generate information regarding the properties of tissues, cells, drug candidates and toxins apart from additional information about the polypeptide itself.

The claimed invention has numerous other uses as a research tool, each of which alone is a “substantial utility.” These include drug screening (pages 36-37).

E. The Patent Examiner Failed to Demonstrate That a Person of Ordinary Skill in the Art Would Reasonably Doubt the Utility of the Claimed Invention

Based principally on citations to scientific literature identifying some of the difficulties involved in predicting protein function, the Examiner rejected the pending claims on the ground that the Applicant cannot impute utility to the claimed invention based on its 52 % homology to another polypeptide undisputed by the Examiner to be useful. The Examiner's rejection is both incorrect as a matter of fact and as a matter of procedural law.

As demonstrated in § II.A., *supra*, the literature cited by the Examiner is not inconsistent with the Applicants' proof of homology by a reasonable probability. It may show that Applicants cannot prove function by homology with **certainty**, but Applicants need not meet such a rigorous standard of proof. Under the applicable law, once the applicant demonstrates a *prima facie* case of homology, the Examiner must accept the assertion of utility to be true unless the Examiner comes forward with evidence showing a person of ordinary skill would doubt the asserted utility could be achieved by a reasonable probability. See *In re Brana*, 51 F.3d at 1566; *In re Langer*, 503 F.2d 1380, 1391-92, 183 USPQ 288 (CCPA 1974). The Examiner has not made such a showing and, as such, the Examiner's rejection should be withdrawn.

In the present case, the Examiner has purported that the degree of amino acid identity between HPAK and other kallikrein family proteins is insufficient to establish that HPAK is a member of the kallikrein family of proteins and thus shares the same utilities. The Examiner attempted to support this assertion with the teachings of Bork (Genome Research, 10:398-400, 2000), Bowie et al. (Science (1990) 247:1306-1310), Lazar et al. (Mol. and Cell. Biol. (1988) 8:1247-1252), and Burgess et al. (J. Cell Biol. (1990) 111:2129-2138), all of record and addressed below. However, all of these references fail to support the outstanding rejections.

The teachings of Bowie et al. are, in part, counter to the outstanding rejections, and in part, supportive of the asserted utilities of HPAK based on amino acid sequence homology to kallikrein family proteins. Careful review of this reference reveals that the teachings of Bowie et al. are directed primarily toward studying the effects of site-directed substitution of amino acid residues in certain proteins in order to determine the relative importance of these residues to protein structure and function.

As discussed below in further detail, such experiments are not relevant to Applicants' use of amino acid sequence homology to reasonably predict protein function.

In support of Applicants' use of amino acid sequence homology to reasonably predict the utility of the claimed polypeptide, Bowie et al. teach that evaluating sets of related sequences, which are members of the same gene family, is an accepted method of identifying functionally important residues that have been conserved over the course of evolution. (Bowie et al., page 1306, 1st column, last paragraph, and 2nd column, 2nd full paragraph; page 1308, 1st column, last paragraph; page 1310, 1st column, last paragraph.) It is known in the art that natural selection acts to conserve protein function. As the Examiner stated and as taught by Bowie et al., proteins are tolerant of numerous amino acid substitutions that maintain protein function, and it is natural selection that permits these substitutions to occur. Conversely, mutations that reduce or abolish protein function are eliminated by natural selection. Based on these central tenets of molecular evolution, Applicants submit that the amino acid differences among the polypeptide encoded by Applicants' claimed polypeptide and known kallikreins are likely to occur at positions of minimal functional importance, while residues that are conserved are likely those that are important for protein function. One of ordinary skill in the art would further conclude that the level of conservation observed between Applicants' claimed polypeptide and polypeptides encoding kallikreins is indicative of a common function, and hence, common utility, among these proteins.

The Examiner further cited Lazar et al. and Burgess et al. as demonstrating that "even a single amino acid change can alter protein function . . ." (Office Action, page 4.) However, these references are not relevant to the case at hand. Lazar et al. describe the mutagenesis of two amino acid residues that are highly conserved among EGFs and TGF- α s. Similarly, Burgess et al., describes mutagenesis of HBGF-1 at an amino acid residue known to be important for ligand binding. In both of these cases, particular amino acid residues with known importance to protein function were specifically targeted for site-directed mutagenesis. These mutations were "artificially" created in the laboratory and, therefore, are **not** analogous to molecular evolution, which is profoundly influenced by natural selection. For example, the deactivating mutations as described by Lazar et al. and Burgess et al. would almost certainly not be tolerated in nature. Furthermore, it is clear that over the course of evolution, amino acid residues that are critical for protein function are **conserved**. Thus, the amino acid differences

between SEQ ID NO:1 and human pancreatic kallikrein are likely to represent substitutions that do **not** alter protein function. Therefore, the teachings of Lazar et al. and Burgess et al. are not relevant to the case at hand.

The Office Action also cited Bork to support the outstanding rejection. Bork states that there are “pitfalls associated with comparative sequence analysis for predicting protein function” and that “computational sequence analysis is far from perfect.” However, Bork emphasizes “high-throughput technologies.” Human pancreatic kallikrein (GI 186653), on the other hand, was analyzed by both laboratory and computational sequence analysis, not the allegedly error-prone high-throughput technologies being denounced by Bork. Consequently, the classification of human pancreatic kallikrein as a serine protease of the kallikrein family is credible scientific evidence and further, has been substantiated by peer review, i.e., those who are skilled in the art (see Fukushima, D. et al., (1985) *Biochemistry* 24:8037-43, of record). Therefore, a sequence such as SEQ ID NO:1 which shares more than 50% homology with human pancreatic kallikrein (GI 186653) not only meets, but exceeds, the criteria of Brenner (*supra*).

The cited evidence is completely insufficient to support the rejections of the claims. The only relevant evidence of record shows that a person of ordinary skill in the art would not doubt that the claimed polypeptide is in fact a member of the kallikrein family of proteins, which are known to have specific utility.

By ignoring the “reasonable correlation” requirement in the case law and failing to illustrate the procedure established by *Brana*, the Examiner has failed to set forth a proper *prima facie* case, and the rejection does not shift the burden of proof to Applicants for rebuttal. In fact, the rejection must be withdrawn, as the Examiner has failed to meet PTO’s burden in the first place of establishing a proper rejection. There is no proper rejection for Applicants to rebut.

IV. By Requiring the Patent Applicant to Assert a Particular or Unique Utility, the Patent Examination Utility Guidelines and Training Materials Applied by the Patent Examiner Misstate the Law

There is an additional, independent reason to overturn the rejections: to the extent the rejections are based on Revised Interim Utility Examination Guidelines (64 FR 71427, December 21, 1999), the final Utility Examination Guidelines (66 FR 1092, January 5, 2001) and/or the Revised Interim Utility Guidelines Training Materials (USPTO Website www.uspto.gov, March 1, 2000), the Guidelines and Training Materials are themselves inconsistent with the law.

The Training Materials, which direct the Examiners regarding how to apply the Utility Guidelines, address the issue of specificity with reference to two kinds of asserted utilities: “specific” utilities, which meet the statutory requirements, and “general” utilities, which do not. The Training Materials define a “specific utility” as follows:

A [specific utility] is *specific* to the subject matter claimed. This contrasts to *general* utility that would be applicable to the broad class of invention. For example, a claim to a polynucleotide whose use is disclosed simply as “gene probe” or “chromosome marker” would not be considered to be specific in the absence of a disclosure of a specific DNA target. Similarly, a general statement of diagnostic utility, such as diagnosing an unspecified disease, would ordinarily be insufficient absent a disclosure of what condition can be diagnosed.

The Training Materials distinguish between “specific” and “general” utilities by assessing whether the asserted utility is sufficiently “particular,” *i.e.*, unique (Training Materials at p.52) as compared to the “broad class of invention.” (In this regard, the Training Materials appear to parallel the view set forth in Stephen G. Kunin, Written Description Guidelines and Utility Guidelines, 82 J.P.T.O.S. 77, 97 (Feb. 2000) (“With regard to the issue of specific utility the question to ask is whether or not a utility set forth in the specification is *particular* to the claimed invention.”).)

Such “unique” or “particular” utilities never have been required by the law. To meet the utility requirement, the invention need only be “practically useful,” *Natta*, 480 F.2d 1 at 1397, and confer a “specific benefit” on the public. *Brenner*, 383 U.S. at 534. Thus incredible “throwaway” utilities, such as trying to “patent a transgenic mouse by saying it makes great snake food,” do not meet this standard.

Karen Hall, Genomic Warfare, The American Lawyer 68 (June 2000) (quoting John Doll, Chief of the Biotech Section of USPTO).

This does not preclude, however, a general utility, contrary to the statement in the Training Materials where “specific utility” is defined (page 5). Practical real-world uses are not limited to uses that are unique to an invention. The law requires that the practical utility be “definite,” not particular. *Montedison*, 664 F.2d at 375. Applicant is not aware of any court that has rejected an assertion of utility on the grounds that it is not “particular” or “unique” to the specific invention. Where courts have found utility to be too “general,” it has been in those cases in which the asserted utility in the patent disclosure was not a practical use that conferred a specific benefit. That is, a person of ordinary skill in the art would have been left to guess as to how to benefit at all from the invention. In *Kirk*, for example, the CCPA held the assertion that a man-made steroid had “useful biological activity” was insufficient where there was no information in the specification as to how that biological activity could be practically used. *Kirk*, 376 F.2d at 941.

The fact that an invention can have a particular use does not provide a basis for requiring a particular use. See *Brana, supra* (disclosure describing a claimed antitumor compound as being homologous to an antitumor compound having activity against a “particular” type of cancer was determined to satisfy the specificity requirement). “Particularity” is not and never has been the *sine qua non* of utility; it is, at most, one of many factors to be considered.

As described *supra*, broad classes of inventions can satisfy the utility requirement so long as a person of ordinary skill in the art would understand how to achieve a practical benefit from knowledge of the class. Only classes that encompass a significant portion of nonuseful members would fail to meet the utility requirement. *Supra* § III.C. (*Montedison*, 664 F.2d at 374-75).

The Training Materials fail to distinguish between broad classes that convey information of practical utility and those that do not, lumping all of them into the latter, unpatentable category of “general” utilities. As a result, the Training Materials paint with too broad a brush. Rigorously applied, they would render unpatentable whole categories of inventions heretofore considered to be patentable, and that have indisputably benefitted the public, including the claimed invention. See *supra* § III.C. Thus the Training Materials cannot be applied consistently with the law.

- V. To the extent the rejection of the patented invention under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, is based on the improper rejection for lack of utility under 35 U.S.C. § 101, it must be reversed.

The rejection set forth in the Office Action is based on the assertions discussed above, i.e., that the claimed invention lacks patentable utility. To the extent that the rejection under § 112, first paragraph, is based on the improper allegation of lack of patentable utility under § 101, it fails for the same reasons.

Written description rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph

Claims 1, 20, 25 and 26 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, alleged lack of an adequate written description. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

The arguments presented in the response filed April 9, 2001 are reiterated herein. The Office Action asserts that the "numerous claimed variants" are not defined in terms of chemical structure. This position, however, blatantly ignores the recitation of "SEQ ID NO:1" as a basis for defining the claimed naturally-occurring variants. Moreover, this position ignores the Brenner et al. document ("Assessing sequence comparisons methods with reliable structurally identified distant evolutionary relationships," Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA (1998) 95:6073-6078; of record), which reports that through exhaustive analysis of a dataset of proteins with known structural and functional relationships and with <40% overall sequence identity, 30% identity has been determined to be a reliable threshold for establishing evolutionary homology between two sequences aligned over at least 150 residues. The "90% variants" claimed in the subject application are clearly of much less variation than the available threshold.

Furthermore, the Office Action asserts that "... the scope of the claims includes numerous structural variants. No common structural attributes that identify the claimed variants are disclosed, because the function of SEQ ID NO:1 is not known." However, as discussed above in connection with the utility rejection, ample evidence has been presented which establishes that SEQ ID NO:1 is a kallikrein. Additionally, Brenner et al. indicate that polypeptides having 90% sequence similarity would be expected to function similarly. The Examiner has failed to provide any evidence of any class of

not
a
kallikrein

proteins in which naturally occurring variants with 90% or greater sequence similarity do not function similarly. Hence, there is no basis for this Patent Office position.

For at least the above reasons, withdrawal of the written description rejection is requested.

Scope rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph

Claims 1, 20, 25 and 26 were also rejected under the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. §112 because the Specification allegedly does not describe how to make and use the claimed variants of SEQ ID NO:1. This rejection is traversed.

As explained in the response filed April 9, 2001, the claims recite not only that the polypeptides have at least 90% sequence identity to SEQ ID NO:1, but also have “*a naturally-occurring amino acid sequence.*” Through the process of natural selection, nature will have determined the appropriate amino acid sequences. Given the information provided by SEQ ID NO:1 (the amino acid sequence of HPAK) and SEQ ID NO:2 (the polynucleotide sequence of HPAK), one of skill in the art would be able to routinely obtain “a naturally-occurring amino acid sequence having at least 90% sequence identity to the sequence of SEQ ID NO:1.” For example, the identification of relevant polynucleotides could be performed by hybridization and/or PCR techniques that were well-known to those skilled in the art at the time the subject application was filed and/or described throughout the Specification of the instant application. See, e.g., page 33, lines 10-22; and Example VI at page 43. Thus, one skilled in the art need not make and test vast numbers of polypeptides that are based on the amino acid sequence of SEQ ID NO:1. Instead, one skilled in the art need only screen a cDNA library or use appropriate PCR conditions to identify relevant polynucleotides/polypeptides that already exist in nature.

As set forth in *In re Marzocchi*, 169 USPQ 367, 369 (CCPA 1971):

The first paragraph of § 112 requires nothing more than objective enablement. How such a teaching is set forth, either by the use of illustrative examples or by broad terminology, is of no importance.

As a matter of Patent Office practice, then, a specification disclosure which contains a teaching of the manner and process of making and using the invention in terms which

correspond in scope to those used in describing and defining the subject matter sought to be patented *must* be taken as in compliance with the enabling requirement of the first paragraph of § 112 *unless* there is reason to doubt the objective truth of the statements contained therein which must be relied on for enabling support.

Contrary to the standard set forth in *Marzocchi*, the Examiner has failed to provide any *reasons* why one would doubt that the guidance provided by the present Specification would enable one to make and use the recited variants of SEQ ID NO:1. Hence, a *prima facie* case for non-enablement has not been established with respect to the recited variants of SEQ ID NO:1, and this rejection should be withdrawn.

Prior art rejections

Claims 1 and 25 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Fukushima, D. et al, (GenBank Accession No. A24696). In addition, a §103(a) rejection of claims 1, 20 and 26 was applied over A24696 in view of Johnstone and Thorpe (Immunochemistry in Practice, 2nd Ed., 1987, Blackwell Scientific Publications, Oxford, pp. 49-50). These rejections are traversed.

According to the Office Action, the Fukushima document is pertinent to “90% variants” and immunogenic fragments of SEQ ID NO:1. To expedite prosecution, the “fragment” language has been deleted from the claims. With respect to the “variants” encompassed by the claims, one must make a comparison along the entire length of SEQ ID NO:1. This is clarified by the amended claim language of “a naturally-occurring amino acid sequence *at least 90% identical* to the sequence of SEQ ID NO:1.” Fukushima et al. does not describe such an amino acid sequence. Withdrawal of these rejections is therefore requested.

CONCLUSION


In light of the above amendments and remarks, Applicants submit that the present application is fully in condition for allowance, and request that the Examiner withdraw the outstanding rejections. Early notice to that effect is earnestly solicited.

Please charge Deposit Account No. **09-0108** in the amount of **\$400.00** as set forth in the enclosed fee transmittal letter. If the USPTO determines that an additional fee is necessary, please charge any required fee to Deposit Account No. **09-0108**.

Respectfully submitted,

INCYTE GENOMICS, INC.

Date: 26 April 2002



Richard C. Ekstrom

Reg. No. 37,027

Direct Dial Telephone: (650) 843-7352

3160 Porter Drive
Palo Alto, California 94304
Phone: (650) 855-0555
Fax: (650) 845-4166

VERSION WITH MARKINGS TO SHOW CHANGES MADE

IN THE CLAIMS:

Claims 11-16 and 21-24 have been cancelled.

Claims 1, 18-20 and 25 have been amended as follows:

1. (Three Times Amended) [A purified] An isolated polypeptide [comprising an amino acid sequence] selected from the group consisting of:

- a) a polypeptide comprising the amino acid sequence of SEQ ID NO:1, and
- b) a polypeptide comprising a naturally-occurring amino acid sequence [having] at least 90% [sequence identity] identical to the sequence of SEQ ID NO:1[, and
- c) an immunogenic fragment of the amino acid sequence of SEQ ID NO:1].

18. (Once Amended) A polypeptide of claim 1, comprising [having] the amino acid sequence of SEQ ID NO:1.

19. (Twice Amended) A composition comprising a polypeptide of claim 18 and [in conjunction with] a suitable pharmaceutical carrier.

20. (Twice Amended) A composition comprising a polypeptide of claim 1 and [in conjunction with] a suitable pharmaceutical carrier.

25. (Once Amended) A polypeptide of claim 1 which comprises a naturally-occurring amino acid sequence [having] at least 90% identical [sequence identity] to the sequence of SEQ ID NO:1.

New claims 27-32 have been added.

27. (New) A method for producing a polypeptide of claim 1, the method comprising:

- c) culturing a cell under conditions suitable for expression of the polypeptide, wherein said cell is transformed with a recombinant polynucleotide, and said recombinant polynucleotide comprises a promoter sequence operably linked to a polynucleotide encoding the polypeptide of claim 1, and
- d) recovering the polypeptide so expressed.

28. (New) A method of claim 27, wherein the polypeptide comprises the sequence of SEQ ID NO:1.

29. (New) A method for screening a compound for effectiveness as an agonist of a polypeptide of claim 1, the method comprising:

- a) exposing a sample comprising a polypeptide of claim 1 to a compound, and
- b) detecting agonist activity in the sample.

30. (New) A method for screening a compound for effectiveness as an antagonist of a polypeptide of claim 1, the method comprising:

- a) exposing a sample comprising a polypeptide of claim 1 to a compound, and
- b) detecting antagonist activity in the sample.

31. (New) A method of screening for a compound that specifically binds to the polypeptide of claim 1, the method comprising:

- a) combining the polypeptide of claim 1 with at least one test compound under suitable conditions, and
- b) detecting binding of the polypeptide of claim 1 to the test compound, thereby identifying a compound that specifically binds to the polypeptide of claim 1.

32. (New) A method of screening for a compound that modulates the activity of the polypeptide of claim 1, said method comprising:

- c) combining the polypeptide of claim 1 with at least one test compound under conditions permissive for the activity of the polypeptide of claim 1,
- d) assessing the activity of the polypeptide of claim 1 in the presence of the test compound, and
- e) comparing the activity of the polypeptide of claim 1 in the presence of the test compound with the activity of the polypeptide of claim 1 in the absence of the test compound, wherein a change in the activity of the polypeptide of claim 1 in the presence of the test compound is indicative of a compound that modulates the activity of the polypeptide of claim 1.